What Moscow Can Do About Matzoth, P. 4

If LBJ Ready to Talk Peace "Any Place, Any Time", Why Not in Vietnam?

"I want this government first of all to be dedicated to peace in our time, and do everything that we can conceivably do, any place, any time, with anyone to resolve some of the differences that exist among mankind. . . .

"Q. One of your speeches at the University of California indicated a kind of hint to me that we might carry the war to the North Vietnamese if they didn't quit meddling in what you call a 'dangerous game.' Are there any such plans that you can talk about, sir?

"A. No, and I made no such hint. I said it was a dangerous game to try to supply arms and become an aggressor and deprive people of their freedom, and that is true, whether it is in Vietnam or whether it is in this hemisphere, wherever it is.

"Q. Mr. President, do we face the decision on Vietnam of the order of magnitude of Korea, for example?

"A. No, I don't think so. . . .

'Some of our people become very impatient. They cut the water off on us in Cuba. . . . Some of them have said—some of the men have even wanted me to run in the Marines, send them in immediately. . . . There are going to be these demands from time to time, people who feel that all we need to do is mash a button and determine everybody's foreign policy. . . . But we are not living in that kind of a world any more."

—President Johnson's TV Interview March 15.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 12 MARCH 23, 1964 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Poverty of Ideas in The Poverty Message

In his address to the Organization of American States on the third anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, President Johnson said "Progress in each country depends upon the willingness of that country to mobilize its own resources, to inspire its own people. . . . Those who are not willing to do that which is unpopular, and that which is difficult will not achieve that which is needed or that which will be lasting." These words may serve as the epitaph of his own "war against poverty," perhaps his administration. Anyone looking objectively at his poverty message and his preliminary remarks about it on TV the previous night must conclude that the most serious obstacle to a real assault upon poverty in this country is the poverty of ideas in the White House.

A Cal Coolidge Democrat

For the new President's consistent restraint in foreign policy and his sober realization of what nuclear war means, we are grateful, as we are grateful for the determination he has demonstrated in the civil rights fight. But the poverty message is deeply disappointing. In this, as in his address to the Organization of American States, Mr. Johnson emerges as a kind of Democratic Cal Coolidge, with a simple-minded faith in free enterprise as understood in Country Club locker rooms. As a politician, he is showing himself far more skilful than his Republican rivals, but these are no geniuses. This is the conventional politics good enough for the conventional world in which our upper and middle classes are comfortably cocooned. But in Latin America, as in Africa and Asia, and in our slums, are smoldering crises which cannot be dealt with by trite ideas and campaign rhetoric. The poverty message is completely lacking in any big conceptions while the OAS speech seemed wholly unaware that the Alliance for Progress is on the rocks and there may be little time before a revolution in Brazil or Peru confronts us with a new and many times bigger "Cuba."

Where Were You Then? Where Are You Now?

We went to an extraordinary luncheon last week for an extraordinary man. It was given for Aubrey Williams by the National Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. He is one of those very few Southerners with the courage to be truly Christian in their relations with the Negro. Martin Luther King's assistant, the Rev. Wyatt Walker, said the Southern Christian Leadership Conference was born in Williams' backyard in Montgomery, Alabama. No one played a more inspiring role in the New Deal than Williams as head of the National Youth Administration. Now, in his 70's, he is still, as always, in the hardest fight—against HUAC. The luncheon showed that in a country which is constantly patting itself on the back for its recovery from McCarthyism too few are willing to stand up in the fight against HUAC. McCarthy was only another in the line of witch hunters which began with Martin Dies as head of HUAC in the 30's. For a quarter of a century this Committee has smeared and blacklisted some of the best Americans of our time. Its methods are the same as McCarthy's. Today in the South HUAC is being used against those fighting segregation. Yet at the luncheon it was pretty much the same slim handful, older and grayer, who fought McCarthy, who turned up against HUAC. Is there no way to grasp the silent by the lapel and ask them: Where were you in the fight against McCarthyism? Where are you now?

The simple truth is that reliance on so-called free enterprise has failed at home and abroad. The most bathetic part of Johnson's TV interview was his soggy tribute to the men who "head our big industries" and "are willing to get up at daylight and get to bed at midnight to offer employment and create new jobs." This may have been successfully calculated to leave not a dry eye in any house where elder statesmen of the National Association of Manufacturers were gathered be-

(Continued on Page Two)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Must Viet Peasants Go On Dying Because We Have An Election Coming?

(Continued from Page One)

fore the TV screen. But an analysis on p. 22 of the manpower report the White House and the Labor Department sent to Congress March 9 tells a different story. Of 4,300,000 new jobs created in this country between 1957 and 1963 only 300,000 were "full time jobs generated by private demand." Government directly or through its procurement, mostly for war, created most of the new jobs. The country's growth lags because its business system sags.

With One Eye on Harry Byrd

The poverty message represented LBJ's moment of decision. Here he had to choose between pleasing Harry Byrd by turning off lights in the White House or alienating the conservatives by turning on some new lights in our national thinking. His nervous disavowal on TV of any intention to take from the haves to give to the have-nots was advance indication of where the choice would be made. Johnson built himself a war on poverty plank for the campaign by putting together some second hand lumber at bargain basement prices. But the idea of a general attack on poverty, which Johnson took over from Kennedy's agenda, cannot easily be stifled. It is up to the independent liberals and radicals of this country now to spell out a program in big terms and begin to sell it to the country. If that job is done, the politicians will come along on poverty as they are coming along on civil rights.

New ideas and movements need also to be generated from below on foreign policy. Trouble lies ahead in Panama if public opinion cannot be taught to see that the perpetual privileges we forced Panama to give us a half century ago are anachronistic in today's world. Johnson here illustrates that well meaning commonplaces are no substitute for positive leadership. We are not living in a world which is guaranteed to wait on the convenience of American elections. We'd better stop expecting the stars to stand still in their courses every other November.

Nowhere is this more true than in South Vietnam. Johnson seems to want to hold the war in suspense, neither withdrawing or expanding it until after the election. Lodge likes the war because it builds up his "image" of the brave sentinel on anti-Communism's frontiers. The Pentagon likes the war because it is a testing ground for new weapons and a training ground for new tactics. If a few more American boys are killed in the process, that is too bad. If more Vietnamese peasants have to be napalmed with their women and children to rout out guerrillas, that too is "c'est la guerre." But it is building a picture of America as a lazy giant who is prepared to sacrifice other people's lives and security because it lacks the intelligence and flexibility to adjust to realities.

Yet all this cannot be laid solely at the door of the White House. The number of voices raised against it in the Senate can be counted, literally, on the fingers of one hand. Gruening of Alaska last week joined with his colleague Bartlett and with Mansfield, Morse and Ellender to question this whole stupid war; Gruening had the courage to call for our withdrawal. But the press gives scant coverage to these speeches and the country is indifferent. So we have the silly comedy of our Secretary of Defense in South Vietnam pledging our support "forever" to another of those here-today-and-gone-tomorrow "strongmen." This latest military miracleman is idiot enough to whip up a campaign to extend his war to the North when he can hardly hold a 50-mile perimeter around his capital in Saigon. From such folly we seem temporarily to be saved. But how long before we start slipping?

Reform At Last

". . . the American government was long opposed to aiding public-controlled industrial development. This policy was particularly noticeable during the Eisenhower administration, and was the cause of considerable strain in Vietnamese-American relations. It gradually gave way before Vietnamese insistence upon at least mixed public-private ownership of new industries."

—South Vietnam: Nation Under Duress by Robert Scigliano (Houghton-Mifflin, 1964).

"Saigon, Mar. 8 (Reuters)—Premier Nguyen Khanh in a broadcast to his nation, last night promised sweeping reforms aimed at rebuilding South Vietnam. . . . Private enterprise would be encouraged as much as possible. 'The government will sell its commercial interests . . . to private investors and establish a stock market'."

—Washington Post, March 8.

This should make it easier for the peasantry to buy some good common stocks.

Gen. Khanh Does A Swift Job of Pulling The Wool Over McNamara's Eyes

"Saigon, Mar. 6 (UPI) Vietnamese Chief of State Nguyen Khanh has been quietly carrying out a major shakeup in this country's military command . . . to reward close supporters of his Jan. 30 coup. Khanh's shakeup was disclosed on the eve of a new Saigon fact-finding visit by Defense Secretary McNamara. The reorganization was reported causing concern as the new Vietnamese chief of state had assured Ambassador Lodge there would be no such major shakeup which could interfere with the war effort . . . almost all the new appointments have been made for political reasons. . . .

"Qualified U.S. military observers believe in some cases the new commanders are as competent as the ones they replaced. But in other cases the military qualities of the appointees are unproven, while in still others they are definitely inferior. The most prominent example of the third category is in the vital 4th army corps, which is responsible for the southern half of the Communist dominated Mekong delta.

"The original commander there, Brig. Gen. Co is considered an outstanding officer by American advisers. Co was replaced by newly promoted Major Gen. Duong Van Duc, an exile general who returned after the coup which overthrew the NGO family regime. Duc's military ability is believed inferior to Co's. He is also considered by some qualified observers to be somewhat emotional and erratic. Duc was one of Khanh's closest collaborators in the coup."

—Washington Post, March 7.

"Hoa, Hoa, March 9 (AP) . . . McNamara told newsmen that he feels there has been progress in South Vietnam since his visit here in December. He credited Khanh's reorganization of the nation's leadership."

—AP ticker March 9, the day after McNamara's arrival.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Long of Missouri Takes The Offensive Against The Use of Secret "Mail Covers"

A Bill to End A Police State Practice by The U.S. Postoffice

A little known police state practice carried on secretly by the Post Office would be ended by a bill which Senator Edward Long (D. Mo) has introduced to prohibit "mail covers." The practice consists of recording all information on the outside of letters. It came sharply to public attention a few weeks ago when Roy Cohn's lawyer protested that his mail had been under this type of surveillance. Serious consideration is assured the bill by the support of Senator Johnston (*D. S.C.*), chairman of the Post Office Committee.

Used to Detect "Subversion"

Although almost unknown to the public, mail covers are frequent practice in the Post Office. Its Chief Counsel Louis Doyle admitted in 1962 to Senator Long that there were between 500 and 750 in operation on a single day. The number was probably higher during the McCarthy era when, according to Doyle, the practice was "useful from time to time in connection with espionage and subversion."

Doyle invoked two Court of Appeals decisions to defend the legality of mail covers. One, *U.S v. Costello* (255 Fed 2d 876), held that mail covers do not violate the law forbidding detention and opening of mail. The other, *U.S. v. Schwartz* (283 Fed 2d 107), held that *postal regulations* are not violated when information from a mail cover is turned over to Justice Department.

Neither meets the issue squarely. Neither did Judge Archie Dawson in the Cohn case. He declined to dismiss on the ground that there was no evidence that the mail had been opened! It is obvious that the government by a mail cover can obtain valuable information without opening the mail. This is the kind of practice Brandeis had in mind when he said "at the foundation of our civil liberties lies the principle which denies to government officials an exceptional position before the law."

Like all clandestine surveillance techniques, mail covers should be banned as beyond effective public control. Mr. Cohn only learned of this through a tip. Not even the present Chief Postal Inspector knows the present extent of the practice. Any one of his 1,000 inspectors can authorize a "cover" and often do as a favor to FBI or local police.

Ironically, "mail cover" first came to public attention when a Senate committee found in 1954 that they had been used in investigating McCarthy. Now ten years later they are in the headlines again because of their use against McCarthy's one-time lieutenant, Roy Cohn. No matter to whom applied, they're dirty business.

Let Freedom Ring
(But Make Sure The Wire Is Tapped)

"Freedom has been taking a real beating at the hands of Federal agents during the past few months. In September we learned that our military intelligence people in West Germany were wiretapping on behalf of a German intelligence agency because the agency itself was prohibited from tapping by the German Constitution. This was certainly a great example for the German people. Shortly after, there began to unfold a story of wiretapping at the State Department. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of State had through a 'misunderstanding' caused the tapping of the telephone of one of his subordinates. This was followed by the report that we are using a field-type lie detector on the Vietnamese people. A practice that is ensured to instruct them in the ways of free men."

—Long (D. Mo) to the Senate March 11 (abridged).

Clark Questions the Right of Senators to Double in Brass As Army Reserve Officers

Mr. CLARK (D. Pa.). There is one more point I believe I should raise for the first time. There is a grave constitutional issue as to whether those holding commissions on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States have any right, either to speak in a matter with respect to which there is an obvious conflict of interest, or any right to serve as Senators of the United States under the Constitution.

Mr. GOLDWATER (R. Ariz.). The Senator has just raised the question of the constitutionality of Reserve officers serving as Senators. I must remind him that I introduced a resolution at the first session of this Senate to call upon the Judiciary Committee to determine this question. I seriously resist the charge of conflict of interest.

Mr. THURMOND (D. S.C.). I am amazed that any member of this body should continue to bring up this question. In 1930, Congress enacted a statute on this very subject, in which it was held that a Reserve officer is not an officer or employe of the U.S. Government.

There is an effort in this country to bring about a sentiment against the military. I have commented today on a book, written by a man who is a confidant and adviser of Cyrus Eaton, Khrushchev's capitalist friend who wants to see this country unilaterally disarmed. The book I am referring to is called "The Passion of the Hawks." *

This man wants to downgrade the Military Establishment. The whole effort is to work toward disarmament. That is the motive behind this effort. Those who have been trying to impugn the motives of the Reserve officers are invariably, almost without exception, people who favor disarmament.

Mr. CLARK. In my view, the statute on which the Senator from South Carolina relies is unconstitutional.

—Abridged from the Congressional Record Feb. 21 in the midst of Clark's attack on the $52 million amendment which the bomber lobby attached to the annual defense bill over the objections of Defense Secretary McNamara.

* This book by Tristram Coffin, subtitled "Militarism in Modern America" (Macmillan: $5.95), which we recommend highly, gives a list of the 82 members of Congress who are Reserve Officers. The highest ranking are Major General Goldwater of the Air Force and Major General Thurmond of the Army. The Army has 34, the Air Force 23, the Navy 20 and the Marine Corps 5 officers in Congress. Mr. Coffin characterizes this as "an ingenious and almost fool-proof system" for organizing the political strength of the military. He writes, "The wearing of both the toga and the sword is plainly illicit and in violation of the Constitution" which says "No person holding any Office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Easy Way For Moscow to End the Usual Flow of Ugly Pre-Passover Stories

Jews Worse Off In Soviet Union Than Anywhere Else In The Bloc

There is one easy way for the Soviet authorities to stop the flood of damaging stories in the Western press as Passover approaches about the difficulties Soviet Jewry has in obtaining *matzoth*. This is simply to reinstate the system whereby until 1962, and even in the worst days of Stalinism, the Jews obtained unleavened bread from State bakeries for the holiday.

It would also improve the standing of the Soviet Union in the outside world if *Trud*, the Soviet labor paper, would cease the publication of vulgar and scurrilous attacks on Israeli diplomats which seem to be an annual feature of this publication as Passover approaches. This year's article by "N. Ehrlich" is similar to those he has written in the past. If the Soviet authorities do not want Israeli visitors to leave behind prayer books in the few synagogues still open in the Soviet Union, they can easily make it unnecessary by allowing Soviet Jews to print their own.

Poland's Exemplary Record

One way to judge Soviet policy is by comparison with Poland. Poland, like Russia, has historically been a hotbed of anti-Semitism. Yet in Poland today the Jews enjoy a freedom that would seem like paradise to their Soviet brothers; it is not surprising that Soviet Jewry was not allowed to send a delegation to Warsaw last April for the commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Ghetto Uprising.

The policy laid down by Gomulka after his restoration to power in 1956 contrasts sharply with Khrushchev's. In an official statement published that year by *Trybuna Ludu*, Polish Jews were offered freedom of choice among three courses: assimilation, the enjoyment of cultural and religious autonomy within the Polish nation or emigration to Israel. This has remained Polish policy since, and has been accompanied by an intense campaign against the survival of anti-Semitism among the people.

Each Communist regime in Eastern Europe seems to have a different Jewish policy. Yugoslav Jewry, before and since the break with Stalin, has never suffered from discrimination. In the bloc itself, Bulgaria, had little anti-Semitism either before or after the Revolution. In the bloc, the condition of the Jews is best in Poland; Hungary is next, then Rumania and Czechoslovakia. The Soviet Union's record is the worst. In each case the status of the Jews is an index of de-Stalinization, and of the cultural level of the ruling bureaucracies.

Among the Russian intellectuals today, the fight against anti-Semitism is as closely linked to the fight against Stalinism as it once was to the fight against Czarism. It is indicative that poets like Yevtushenko and writers like Nekrassov are champions of the Jews—and are constantly in hot water with the bureaucrats from Khrushchev down.

The famous veteran Soviet novelist Konstantin Paustovsky, accused Soviet authorities in 1956 of anti-Semitic views "of a kind worthy of pogrom-makers." That this has changed but little is indicated by the kind of cartoons which illustrate a booklet "Judaism Without Embellishment" published last year in the Soviet Union by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. These cartoons are of the vicious type which once appeared in the Nazi *Der Stuermer*. This whole Soviet record is a disgrace to socialism.

From An Appeal to Khrushchev

"Many of us are lifelong non-believers in any religion. Nonetheless we believe the the freedom to practice religious views should be allowed Jews of the Soviet Union in the same manner that such freedom is granted people of other religious persuasion. We are concerned that the process of restitution of Jewish cultural activities has been slow. The journals and theatres of much smaller groups are more plentiful. We are deeply troubled that there should be articles in Soviet journals of many Republics expressing hostility to Jewish people as such and using terms such as 'vermin', 'blood-suckers', 'parasites' in combination with caricatures of Jews."

—From a letter recently sent Khrushchev by Bertrand Russell, Queen Elizabeth of the Belgians, Max Born, Martin Buber, Ricardo Lombardi, Francois Mauriac, Otto Nathan, Lord Boyd Orr, Linus Pauling, Albert Schweitzer, Norman Thomas and Gisuseppe Ungaretti.

Free Copies of This or Any Other Issue Mailed Free to Friends If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope and Specify Which Issue

I. F. Stone's Weekly **5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.**

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

3/23/64

For this additional $5.35 please send a copy of I. F. Stone's "The Haunted Fifties."

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Newspaper

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED